THEOLOGY

L. L JUNE, 1947 No. 324

Editorial

MANY themes that are central in Christian theology are illuminated Prof. C. H. Dodd's William Ainslie Memorial Lecture, *The Gospel the Law of Christ* (Longmans, 1s. 6d.). The English have a now eterate tendency to look upon Christianity as a code of ethics. e fact that Pelagius is the first British theologian known to history y be significant, though it would not be easy to show that his in- nce upon our theology has been direct or continuous. Anyhow, pit tirades against Pelagianism are seldom understood; moreover, hey were understood, they might be exceedingly subversive. What eft of our national concern for ethical standards needs not to be acked or depreciated but to be raised and enlarged. We are not ng in supposing that Christianity is essentially bound up with good duct. What we need is to be shown positively that the Gospel sets rality in quite a new perspective. This is what Prof. Dodd's lec- e does. It should be found invaluable by preachers. It lays bare the umptions from which all preaching ought to proceed.

* * * * * *

Human Rights and Religious Freedom (Edinburgh House, 3d.) is a tement that has been issued by a Joint Committee that was set up er the auspices of the British Council of Churches and the Conference Missionary Societies. In Great Britain we have come to take eligious freedom " so easily for granted that we forget how recent an ievement it is in our own history, how far from being obvious this ht may seem to be when it is called in question ("To every man his n conscience is God" is not a Christian sentiment, as Prof. Dodd nts out), in how large a part of the world the right to religious free- m is at present denied, and in how many ways its exercise can be tricted. The present statement seeks to indicate a theoretical basis a charter of religious freedom, and then to outline such a charter. should have welcomed a fuller treatment of the basic principles. t anyone may carry the inquiry further by asking why in the end the rious rights that are specified ought to be guaranteed in a civilized iety.

The Anglican Episcopate, 1780-1945

In a recent work seven archbishops were used as pegs on which to hang an oddly balanced exposition of anglicanism from the Middle Ages to the present day. It need scarcely be said that this is an unfruitful approach to ecclesiastical history. A prominent churchman in any epoch may be unrepresentative, or even reticent. The method, however, has this to be said for it, that if the leading group of any organization be taken as a whole it will reflect the tendencies governing that organization's development. And if one wishes to study any community it is vital to discover on what grounds its leaders are selected and what types of men are placed in posts of high responsibility.

The promotions to the episcopate made in the half-century before 1830 reflect strikingly the eighteenth-century political compromise. The great landed families who kept in their hands the mainsprings of political power were ready to respect and employ ability from without their ranks. Control but not monopoly was their guiding principle. This did not of course imply an undue degree of renunciation. Of the sixty-three bishops placed on the bench during this period eleven were the sons of peers, one (Bathurst of Norwich) was the nephew of a peer and three were the grandsons of peers. In addition Cornewall of Worcester was a cousin of the Speaker who aided him at the outset of his career, Madan was the son of an M.P., Moss was the son of a bishop, Law of Bath and Wells was both the son of a bishop and brother of a chief justice, and Thurlow was a brother of the most overbearing political lawyer of the day.

It is easy to understand why Bathursts, Bagots, Norths and Ryders, members of families which supplied cabinet timber for a century, were elevated to the bench. The promotion of men not born in the governing class is often less easily explained. In each case probably several factors played a part. To attribute a particular bishop's elevation to one of them alone would tend to give a false picture. However, it may be noticed that, of the remaining forty-three bishops, five had helped to educate members of the royal family (and it may be added that Jackson of Oxford received the mitre declined by his brother the preceptor of George IV), and that eight others had been tutors in noble households—thus justifying the belief that educating the great was a pathway to preferment. Moreover, Pretyman, Randolph and Lloyd (as college tutors) and Huntingford (as an assistant master at Winchester) had respectively, as grateful pupils, Pitt, Grenville, Peel and Addington. Good enough of Carlisle had conducted a fashionable school, and Buckner of Chichester as private chaplain to the Duke of Richmond had officiated with the regiment which his grace commanded at the siege of Havannah. Carey of Exeter had been a popular and successful headmaster of Westminster. Sumner of Winchester and Carr of Worcester directly owed their promotion to even more august patronage. They had both attracted the attention of George IV—the one by his manners, the other by his preaching, and he had pressed their names on his ministers. Three bishops before their promotion to the bench had attracted attention as pamphleteers, Butler of Hereford by defending Lord

orth's American policy, Marsh of Peterborough, an erudite and oneering scholar, by providing (at considerable risk to himself) itt's government with war propaganda for home and foreign con- mption, and Phillpotts of Exeter by proving himself to be an inde- tigable and undaunted Tory controversialist.

Distinction in scholarship might also lead to the bench. Indeed Fox aring one of his brief periods of power declared that he would never ake a man a bishop who was not eminent in some branch of learning.[1] ore successful politicians who enjoyed more substantial terms of fice honoured Fox's ideal at least intermittently.

Hurd, Kaye, Monk and Blomfield were distinguished members of e learned circle which centred round Parr and Porson (thus illustrat- g the truth of Dean Gaisford's remark on the advantages of a assical education). Horsley was well known for his work in astronomy, athematics, theology and classical philology. Porteus, Gray, Bethell nd Van Mildert were the authors of theological works which com- anded contemporary respect.

It would be trite to emphasize that pressure exerted by the great olitical families played an important part in determining the composi- on of the episcopate in the pre-reform era. Indeed, Butler, the famous eadmaster of Shrewsbury, having surveyed the bench with the enetrating severity of a disappointed man, declared that one could ot find a man on it who did not owe his promotion to "private tuition family connection."[2] But it should not be overlooked that only about ne third of the bishops appointed between 1781 and 1830 (twenty out sixty-three) were connected with the ruling families; and even this gure of twenty is arrived at by counting such men as Thurlow, Moss nd Cornewall. Only about a quarter of the total of sixty-three were osely connected with the peerage. But though two-thirds of the piscopate were not drawn from the ruling classes, it is true, as Butler ys, that many of them had been associated with a great family at me stage in their careers. And though in a few rare cases an out- anding reputation in scholarship might attract the attention of a inister, normally a patron was the means through which a clergyman as brought to the notice of the appointing powers. Again it must not forgotten that several of the early-nineteenth-century prime ministers, r instance Perceval, Addington and Liverpool, were keen churchmen. heir critics might say that they identified the Church too closely with ne Tory party. If this is true, it at least increased their zeal for its welfare.

After 1830 English politicians had to work in a new and changing nvironment. An era of efficiency had begun. Public opinion was owerful, alert, critical and well-informed. Within the Church of ngland tendencies which had existed for centuries became embodied ecclesiastical parties equipped with the usual persuasive apparatus the period—societies, periodicals and public meetings. These factors aturally influenced episcopal appointments. Admittedly some little me passed before their effect was apparent. Grey, the first post-reform

[1] J. Russell, *Memorials . . . of C. J. Fox* (London, 1858), iv, 141-2.
[2] S. Butler, *Life and Letters of Dr Samuel Butler* (1896), ii, 95-96.

prime minister, filled only two sees during his term of office. To one of them he appointed his brother Edward, to the other Maltby, a distinguished classical scholar who had once been tutor in a great Whig household. But when Melbourne was asked to make Arnold a bishop he refused, not wanting to give high churchmen a handle against his government.[1] Peel and Russell agreed in disliking and distrusting the tractarians.[2] Aberdeen, probably influenced by the fact that several of his political associates sympathized with the Oxford Movement, was willing to place on the bench a man belonging to any church party, provided he was distinguished by true "moderation of character and opinions."[3] Palmerston, his successor, was, in his episcopal appointments, actuated by a convenient mixture of prejudice or conviction and blatant opportunism. Having in the course of his career left the Tories and quarrelled with the Whigs, he was largely dependent on his popularity in the country. And this he knew could be affected by his ecclesiastical appointments. Being ignorant of church matters, not knowing "in theology Moses from Sydney Smith," he relied almost entirely on the advice of his relation, the high-minded and hard-working evangelical leader, Lord Shaftesbury. Shaftesbury was a thorough-going partisan and aimed at packing the bench with evangelicals of his own school. Of Palmerston's first five bishops, four (appointed in succession) were distinguished in the words of *The Times* "less for intellectual culture than for their practical piety, their success as parochial ministers and their sympathy with protestant dissenters." The queen remonstrated, arguing that Lord Palmerston should not "confine the selection to respectable parish priests," for the bench would be seriously weakened if "in controversies on points of doctrine agitating the Church no value were attached to the opinions at least of some of those who govern her." Shaftesbury, ruefully reflecting that the "knowledge of mankind and parochial experience are not acquired in musty libraries or armchairs," was compelled to modify his policy in deference to public opinion. And though the nine bishops appointed by Palmerston between 1860 and his death were with one or two exceptions low churchmen, they all had respectable academic records. In one respect, however, the early episcopal appointments were a success. According to Shaftesbury they "influenced elections, turned votes in the House of Commons, and raised round him [Palmerston] a strong party in the country." Shaftesbury of course is scarcely an unbiased witness, but Aberdeen, a critical opponent, agreed with him. Palmerston, he complained, could do anything with impunity, for "should the public disapprobation become more and more manifest the early appointment of one or two low church bishops will set all right."[4] Disraeli too appreciated the strength of protestant feeling in England, and at a critical stage of his career, when the election of 1868 was approaching he was anxious to conciliate this feeling, and thus capture a substantial

[1] Torrens, *Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne* (1878), ii, 181.
[2] C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel* (1899), iii, 416-22.
[3] F. Balfour, *Life of 4th Earl of Aberdeen* (1922), ii, 199-200.
[4] Hodder, *Life of 7th Earl of Shaftesbury* (1886), ii, 505; iii, 183-202; Balfour, *Life of 4th Earl of Aberdeen*, ii, 315; *Letters of Queen Victoria*, iii, 529.

flock of voters, by the appointment of an indubitable low churchman to the bench. Unfortunately (from the electioneering point of view) he was handicapped by the refusal of any of the existing bishops to die, and was compelled to display his adherence to protestant principles by presenting a vociferous low churchman to a deanery.[1]

The general principle, however, which Disraeli wished to follow in making ecclesiastical appointments was to select men from "the legitimate high church and evangelical parties, discountenancing to the uttmost romanism [*i.e.*, ritualism] and not patronizing neology [*i.e.*, the extreme broad church outlook]." Indeed, when a certain amount of ingenious if eccentric theorizing is discounted, it is clear that Disraeli, like the other Victorian prime ministers, simply aimed at placing moderate men on the bench. At the beginning of the Victorian era Russell laid down that a bishop should "avoid quarrels and crochets and live quietly with all men." And near its close Salisbury declared that "combative men," "mere gladiators" were a curse to the Church. Most prime ministers in the century following the great Reform Bill admittedly had their predilections when it came to making ecclesiastical appointments—for instance, Gladstone was very ready to promote the new species of high churchman, Campbell-Bannerman tended to appoint liberal and low churchmen (because he believed that the high church party had been unduly favoured in the recent past), and naturally enough, while Asquith was interested in a potential bishop's academic record, Lloyd George set a high value on oratorical ability.[2] Nevertheless all the prime ministers of the period would have agreed with Halifax that "nice disputes [on religious topics] are never of equal moment with the public peace." And it may be added that Archbishop Davidson, who as the friend and adviser of successive Sovereigns and ministers enjoyed an impressive and unprecedented position, thoroughly sympathized with the instinctive eagerness of English politicians to keep a mean between the two extremes. As a result, at a time when the Church of England was rent by conflicts and distressed by novelties, the bench of bishops remained a comparatively homogeneous body, intent, in spite of urgent though often contradictory exhortations to decided action, on maintaining the greatest possible degree of unity.

Though after the 30's the ministers who managed the ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown could not ignore the problems arising from the vehement party divisions within the Church, yet in another respect their task was lightened. The new standards of public behaviour which rapidly gained ground during the nineteenth century inhibited or at least checked the more direct methods of importuning for promotion. Partly as a result of this, political factors played a remarkably small part in determining who was to be placed on the bench. Of course during the long era of Tory ascendancy which ended in 1830 a tincture of whiggery in a clergyman's outlook would have been a bar or at least a hindrance to his promotion. And naturally enough when the Whigs

[1] Buckle, *Life of Disraeli* (1920), v, ch. 2; *Letters of Queen Victoria*, 2nd series, i, 548-51.
[2] G. Cecil, *Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury*, iv, 215; J. A. Spender, *Life of Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman* (1924), ii; G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson* (1935), ch. 8; *Letters of Queen Victoria*, ii, 159.

came into power they showed a tendency to redress the balance. Consequently, with one or two exceptions, the bishops appointed in the decade after 1830 were Whig or Liberal in politics. Melbourne indeed expected "a general disposition to support the measures of his government in the bishops he appointed."[1] But a decade later Palmerston writing privately to a friend declared that he never considered ecclesiastical appointments "as patronage to be given away for . . . personal or political objects."[2] And this dictum, slightly qualified, sums up the accepted practice from then onwards. Admittedly in a few cases a bishop's political views may have been an important factor in securing his elevation to the bench. For instance Jacobson of Chester acted as chairman of Gladstone's committee at Oxford in the election of 1859, and shortly afterwards Gladstone pressed his claims for a mitre on Palmerston. It is unlikely too that Mackarness of Oxford, who lost his seat in Convocation over his attitude on Irish disestablishment, or Stubbs of Truro, who strongly sympathized with the agricultural labourer, or Percival of Hereford, whose general outlook led him on most issues "to claim moral sanction for the liberal solution of the question," would have mounted the bench if the Liberals had not been in office. But since many *episcopabili* had not pronounced political views, the appointing politicians, who were after all genuinely concerned for the Church's welfare, seldom if ever considered using their ecclesiastical patronage for the purpose of increasing their political influence. In this connexion it may be observed that Gladstone's comment that "the attendance of bishops in the House of Lords, except upon church and semi-church questions, has immensely fallen off, and the political function is upon the whole sacrificed to diocesan duty,"[3] is confirmed by a study of the lords' division lists. Rarely in the last hundred years have more than a dozen bishops voted, even on an important issue (though interestingly enough in 1893 almost the whole bench attended to vote against the Home Rule Bill) and frequently in a comparatively full house no episcopal votes have been cast.

In another way the links between the episcopal bench and the lay peerage have been weakened. In the half-century preceding 1830 there were eleven peers' sons placed on the bench. In the century following that date there were only nine, and eight of these were consecrated before 1900. On the other hand Sydney Smith's assertion that "the great emoluments of the Church are flung open to the lowest ranks of the community. Butchers, bakers, publicans and schoolmasters perpetually see their children elevated to the mitre" has become even less true in the last hundred years than when he made it. It is difficult to arrive at a generally accepted system of social stratification; but even allowing for the somewhat supercilious standards which Sydney Smith may have imbibed in whig society he greatly exaggerates. Of those who were elevated to the bench in his lifetime only two or three could reasonably be regarded as coming from the lower ranks of the community. Parsons,

[1] S. Butler, *Life and Letters of Dr Samuel Butler*, ii, 148.
[2] E. Ashley, *Life of Viscount Palmerston* (1876), ii, 226.
[3] Gladstone's *Correspondence on Church and Religion* (1910), ii, 181.

who was the son of a butler (though indeed a college butler), and Butler of Hereford, who "began life in an obscure situation from which his first marriage did not elevate him"[1] (his second, combined with vigorous pamphleteering, fortunately did), had perhaps the humblest origins. The pugnacious Phillpotts was indeed the son of a publican, but his father was also a manufacturer and land agent. Moore of Canterbury was said to be the son of a butcher, but (as in the case of a more famous ecclesiastic) the report was based on the fact that his father was a well-off grazier. An archbishop (Markham of York) and a bishop (Blomfield of London) were admittedly the sons of schoolmasters. Hurd's father was a substantial farmer, and several bishops were sons of tradesmen in more or less prosperous circumstances. As the instances we have just given include all the bishops who began life in comparatively humble circumstances, it is scarcely necessary to say that on the whole the episcopal bench was recruited from what on any sensible analysis would be called the middle and upper classes. And it is possible to argue that since 1830 there has been a tendency for bishops to come from the upper rather than the lower sections of that vague entity the middle class. The following table, showing the percentage of those appointed during different periods educated at a public school, certainly suggests such a conclusion.

Period	Percentage of public-school men placed on the bench
1831-1880	42
1881-1905	50
1906-1930	79
1931-1945	76

Of course these figures may merely show the rapid evolution of the public-school habit among those classes which approved of the institution and could afford to pay the fees demanded.

There is one striking feature about the parental origins of bishops which is shown in the following table:

Period	Percentage of those appointed bishops who were sons of clergy
1781-1830	32
1831-1880	20
1881-1905	44
1906-1930	55
1931-1945	44

For the rest the members of the bench have come from a diversity of backgrounds. Longley was the son of a police magistrate, Hampden of a militia officer, Tait of a farmer, Baring of a banker and Selwyn of a barrister. Westcott, Lightfoot, Creighton and Stubbs were the sons of a science lecturer, an accountant, a solicitor and a timber merchant respectively.

But though the members of the bench have come from widely

[1] *Genl. Mag.*, xxii, pt. 2, 1070; *A Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton* (1838), p. 10.

differing types of home and school, some degree of uniformity in tone and outlook has been imparted to them at the university. For nearly all the English diocesan bishops appointed between 1781 and 1945 have been educated at either Oxford or Cambridge. In fact there have been only eight exceptions—Magee (an episcopal Sydney Smith) and Bardsley, who were graduates of Dublin; Wakefield, Partridge and Simpson, who were educated at Bonn, London and Durham respectively; Butler of Hereford and Cash who did not attend a university; and Watts-Ditchfield, who began as a Methodist and whose promotion aroused considerable comment since he had not enjoyed the usual education of an anglican clergyman.

Some time about the end of the third quarter of the nineteenth century a change occurred in the academic standing of those placed on the bench. Of the bishops appointed between 1830 and 1880 about four-fifths had had distinguished academic careers, but of those appointed after the latter date only half could be said to have distinguished themselves at the university. For the purpose of comparison election to fellowship shortly after graduation or the possession of a first-class degree has been taken as indicating academic distinction. Admittedly these criteria are open to criticism: men of decided and original ability have failed to win the approval of the governing body of their college, and dull and commonplace men have secured high places in the class list. Still, allowing for the unsatisfactory nature of the standards selected, the following table[1] may be of some interest:

Period	Percentage of those appointed bishops who were academically distinguished
1830-1880	80 (including 6 heads of colleges)
1881-1905	49 („ 3 „ „ „)
1906-1930	46 („ 4 „ „ „)
1931-1945	41 („ 1 „ „ „)

These figures reflect both changes in the realm of scholarship and the emergence of a new type of bishop. At the beginning of the nineteenth century mathematics, classics and philosophy practically monopolized the prestige pertaining to learning. Thus a sound theologian ought to have had an easy command over most of the subjects on which other scholars laboured and with which all cultivated men wished to be acquainted. In addition, the great majority of academic posts were reserved for persons in holy orders. But the rapid increase of cultural activities, the widening scope of scientific investigation and the growth of specialization weakened the prestige of theology as an academic subject. After the middle of the nineteenth century most academic posts were open to laymen. Thus a keen and competent theologian had less opportunity of winning academic distinction and office.

Simultaneously there was a growing tendency to emphasize the value of pastoral and administrative ability. In the pre-reform era a few

[1] *Annual Register*, 1923, p. 140.

bishops, such as Charles Sumner at Highclere and Blomfield at St Botolph's, Bishopsgate, had been capable and devoted parish ministers before their promotion. Still a reputation for parochial work would by itself have scarcely proved sufficient to ensure elevation to the bench. But a number of the bishops chosen after 1830 were men who had striven by teaching, preaching and building to christianize the new industrial centres. For instance, in the half-century after 1860 no fewer than five vicars of Leeds were appointed to bishoprics.

It was not only in the parochial sphere that a clergyman could display administrative capacity. The heads of houses at Oxford and Cambridge were from time to time placed on the bench. Then, from the 30's onwards the public school—a comparatively malleable institution whose head was practically an autocrat—offered a sphere in which organizing ability could have full scope; and between 1830 and 1945 about eighteen public-school headmasters were placed on the bench. Six indeed became archbishops—the two Temples, Tait, Benson, Fisher and Longley—though the last named's sufferings at Harrow scarcely foreshadowed his success as a vigorous diocesan.

To try to estimate the part played by the episcopate in English life during the last two centuries would be a bold, probably impossible and certainly impertinent task. Only one or two generalizations will be attempted. On the whole the status of the individual bishop has declined. If he is a scholar his subject is one which at the moment does not command the attention of the public. And in any case his administrative duties leave him little leisure for learned pursuits. Again, the fact that England is no longer a hierarchical society dominated by a landed aristocracy has helped to diminish the bishop's state. Harcourt, with his public days on which any gentleman might dine at his table, or Hurd[1] (a modest scholar), going to Bath with twelve attendants, not as his biographer is careful to point out "from ostentation," were naturally more outstanding figures than their less picturesque and more utilitarian successors. That unbending Tory the Duke of Cumberland, unconsciously imitating Carlyle, dated the decline in the bishop's status from the surrender of the episcopal wig. Writing in the 40's he bitterly compared the bishops of the past, arrayed in purple coats, short cassocks, silk stockings and cocked hats, with Blomfield of London, whom he had "seen in a black Wellington coat, top boots and a hat like a butcher or a coal merchant."[2]

But though the modern bishop may in his secular aspects resemble a higher civil servant or business executive rather than a great nobleman, the episcopate can continue to make a useful contribution to English life. With greater independence than any elected persons and possessing a far older and more generous tradition than any bureaucrat can lay claim to, the English bishops can still fulfil their twofold function of guiding the Church and supporting the State with wise counsel and candid criticism.

R. B. McDowell.

[1] *Letters of the King of Hanover to Viscount Strangford* (1925), pp. 70-72.
[2] Kilvert, *Memoirs of Rt Rev. Richard Hurd* (1860), p. 127.

The Work and the Workers

Hugh Lister and Henri Godin

My purpose in this article is to compare and contrast the life and teaching of two priests, the one Scots and Anglican, the other French and Roman Catholic, who, differing from one another in almost everything else, were both alike desperately concerned about the separation they felt to exist between the Church and the working class.

In neither case have we full biographies to work on; for neither has been very long dead. In the case of Hugh Lister we have the book *In Pursuit of Justice. The Story of Hugh Lister and his Friends of Hackney Wick*, by Alice Cameron.[1] The writer appears from internal evidence to have been one of the people associated with Lister's trade union work, and it is this side of him which receives the fullest documentation and there is, alas! all too little about the things we should all like to know—namely, how he dealt with the spiritual tensions involved in relating the varied elements of the way of life he felt called upon to embrace.

The Abbé Godin has likewise no biographer and what little we have to say of him is based upon the slender but revealing *Témoignages*[2] put out since his death by those who were influenced by him and by those who were familiar with the man and his work.

Hugh Lister was of Scots descent and connected with the family of Lord Lister, the great surgeon. His early interests were almost entirely mechanical and his skill with his hands was with him to the end. We are reminded immediately that Godin too was noted as anything but a duffer in electrical matters. Lister studied for the Engineering Tripos at Cambridge and settled to what seemed a steady career in the Engineering Section of the Great Western Railway.

Our records do not tell us much about the inside story of this crucial period of his life. But his first contact with men of varied types seems to have convinced him that his work was to lie with them rather than with machines. The long and exhausting walks of this period of uncertainty and the ascetic practices of his life at Cuddesdon reveal the authentic note of heroic Christian discipleship and already suggest that this young ordinand at any rate will react unfavourably in the presence of that subtle conspiracy towards conventionality which has been the mark of so many theological colleges. A curacy at All Saints', Poplar, and a period as an S.C.M. secretary, which was followed by a breakdown in health, gave him both the material for a new judgment on the relation of Church and world and the enforced leisure in which to digest it. There followed the period at the Eton Mission in Hackney Wick in which he felt compelled to work out in practice some of the principles in which he had come to believe.

Eric Fenn in his introduction to the book *In Pursuit of Justice* refers to Lister's alarming directness and hints, in speaking of his period as an S.C.M. Secretary, that he had a habit of close concentration on

---

[1] S.C.M. Press: London, 1946. 8s. 6d.

[2] *Témoignages sur l'abbé Godin*. Les Editions Ouvrières. Paris. But see now the life by Canon Glorieux. Bonne Presse. Paris.

certain areas of his responsibility to the almost complete neglect of others. This is what we should expect of him. His first contact with the social problem which brought about the reorientation of his way of life was responded to with a similar directness. Too many of us, alas! are so much aware of the wood that we do not see the trees, and it is as if we are so bemused by the problems of erosion that we have forgotten how to raise a tree. Lister was one of those who are never likely to forget that the darkling complexities of the 'dreadful wood' which is our modern self-conscious world are constituted by this man's need and that man's. In effect he had grasped the essential and liberating principle of the pastor's task. *Non omnia possumus omnes*. But because we cannot all do everything that is necessary to restore in a moment the broken image of man's shattered being, this does not absolve us from the simple and straightforward work of picking up the bits; of doing what we can, where we can, in the place we are least likely to find it congenial. St Peter Claver did not discuss the slave trade; he treated slaves as human beings; and while he did so seems to have been singularly unpreoccupied with the task of spreading Latin Christianity.

Hugh Lister similarly does not seem to have been unaware of the complexities of the relation between evangelical truths and patterns of living and the modern urban-industrial way of life. But he does not seem to have allowed his essential Christianity to become dissipated in theoretical dreaming or mannered discussion. God forbid that we should decry the work or the vocation of the theorist, the contemplative, the prophet. But as far as the Anglican clergy are concerned there seems a tendency for all the Lord's people to be prophets. So many people are encouraged to read so many things and live and work on a plane to which they are not really called that they miss the God-given opportunity which lies before their noses. We need to recover a sort of asceticism of interest in order to show forth once more to the world that directness and simplicity it once found in Christians.

How many of us could cap the story Maritain tells of the meeting between Père Lamy and the dying French composer Erik Satie?[1] Maritain warned Père Lamy at great length about Satie; that he was a great and sensitive artist, must be handled gently and so on. But the holy old priest cared for none of these things and talked about the weather or old-fashioned remedies until something about music came up. "Ah," said Père Lamy, "so you are a musician." "Yes," replied Satie with modesty, "more or less." The old priest blundered away, suggesting that perhaps he ran a choral society, or gave piano lessons or was a music teacher. Maritain was dying of shame and thought that all was lost with the soul of Erik Satie, the crucial interview so badly bungled by this old priest. But not at all. His sincerity and simplicity won Satie completely and, as is now well known, he died a Catholic.

Hugh Lister's priesthood was many times removed from that of Jean Édouard Lamy, but it has a similar directness and simplicity. He concentrated on the plain facts of a local situation which seemed to him to

[1] Narrated in Maritain's Introduction to *Père Lamy*, by Comte Paul Biver (Burns Oates and Washbourne, London).

involve a denial of natural justice. This capacity to do one thing at a time and that the right thing is the quality which he shares with this simple old French priest.

Lister thought that it was only right for him to leave the Mission House and take a place of his own to which men could come and go as they pleased and feel not the least restraint of ecclesiastical origin. Thus it was that 21 Brookfield Road became in effect what The Hostel of the Good Shepherd, Tredegar,[1] was in its first conception and what Dorothy Day achieved in her first House of Hospitality in New York.[2] In this house Lister lived till the outbreak of the war. He rose at 6.30 and said or heard Mass at the Eton Mission Church, returning to his trade union work for the morning—typing, duplicating, interviewing. At midday he spoke at factory gates, distributed leaflets, boosted the union which he was struggling to set on a firm footing.

Here arises our first question. Was he justified in this concentration on so limited an objective? Was he failing to draw all his studies one way? Was this just a simple case of a mistaken vocation? Should he in fact never have been a priest at all? There must have been many who said so. And, indeed, in the light of prevailing traditions of the priestly vocation, they were right. But are we to continue to hold uncriticized this, not very ancient, highly professionalized view of the priestly vocation, deriving, I suppose, from the impact in England on the Oxford reformers of French models, Jesuit, Sulpician, Vincentian? In other times and in other places the hieratic vocation has not been so closely conceived. Ambrose and Paulinus of Nola seem to have been singularly unprofessionalized clergymen and able to play a vital part in the common concerns of their people and of their times without in any way appearing to degenerate into *politiques* or prince-bishops. Are we quite beside the point then in pleading for a return to a more pastoral and less parochial conception of the life and work of the priest? In every way, to sustain this vocation it will in another sense be necessary to be *more* 'professional' than we are now. Is not this recovery of the sense of responsibility to those untouchable by the existing pastoral apparatus the hall mark of every great church reform? To evolve a new method of penetrating spheres of living which are closed to the influence of the *pastor loci*? If Hugh Lister set out simply to "win the support of the working class for the church" it would have been a cheap vulgarity. But, thank God, there is no hint of this in his life. If this life simply involved the uncritical acceptance of one horn of the classic dilemma—Church or world, humanism or rigorism—then he has little to tell us. But there is a world of difference between his life and that, for instance, of the young dissenting minister who abandons his rostrum for the more fruitful work of a probation officer.

There is no evidence that Hugh Lister had ever come in contact with Canon Cardijn's work of genius in the JOC. But he seems to have stumbled upon some of the methods independently. He lived at the top

[1] See *The Hostel of the Good Shepherd*, by Kent White. Hodder and Stoughton.
[2] *House of Hospitality*, by Dorothy Day. Sheed and Ward.

of his house in great simplicity and turned the lower part into a sort of free-and-easy club room. Once a week there were simple Bible readings by inquirers, "commented on and discussed in a fresh and informal way." This is strongly reminiscent of a JOC technique. Some of his friends occasionally accompanied him to church and learned to join in Sunday worship at the Eton Mission church, worship at which—interesting point—he was often himself present as a member of the rank and file. He stressed always the value of *small* groups and expressed a belief that "what we have to attend to in church is community, not morals. Have a community which prays to Christ and morals can look after themselves." He was deeply conscious of the way in which the mere possibility of the Church as a true community is precluded by the broken pattern of family and social life to-day. Since, alas! we are all compelled to provide so many opportunities of worship to suit the needs of so many small groups of diverse traditions and diverse opportunities, it is small wonder that we only rarely succeed in building up the life of the Church as a true community.

Lister was fortunate in the possession of some small private means which made it possible for him to buy and maintain the house in which he lived, though in his personal life he lived scrupulously according to prevailing working-class standards.

With the approach of war his intense single-mindedness led him first to launch the campaign to get the notion of conscription accepted in the particularly unfruitful ground of trade union circles and then to the conviction that he should himself serve as a combatant. It will come as no surprise to students of characteristic types of spirituality to learn that he had from childhood been attracted by the military ideal and was enamoured of military science and traditions. Had he lived he might have become the founder of a new congregation of spiritual desperadoes who would have accepted as their mission field the modern urban proletariat; as another ex-soldier accepted that of the lapsed and lapsing Catholics of reformation Europe or the pagans of the Orinoco. There is much of the Ignatian temper in Hugh Lister and something even fitting in his death in the 1945 breakthrough from France into Holland, when, after years of work with training units, he found himself called upon in an emergency to serve with his own battalion of the Welsh Guards.

Our other priest, Henri Godin, made his first communion in 1916 and his vocation matured in the concluding years of the First World War. As a seminarist he was noted by his fellows for his air of premature seriousness, and the one thing that everyone seems to have remembered about him was that he read through the entire works of St Augustine in Migne. We can well understand how this young priest so easily gravitated to the apostolate of *Le Christ Ouvrier*!

At his first curacy he was a highly popular JOC chaplain and was soon called upon to concentrate on this work, for which he was so clearly gifted. Like many successful field workers, he found the desk uncongenial to him and contrived always to keep in touch with certain notoriously difficult groups of the JOC so as to keep his hand in. But

like Hugh Lister he felt he wanted living and not administrative contact with those whom he considered it was his vocation to serve. He contrived eventually to get himself set up in a very simple ménage in the midst of a working-class district. Here he seems to have been bold enough to break away in almost every respect from the Sulpician tradition of French priesthood. He was careless about his meals; careless about his sleep; careless about his personal appearance. He regarded himself as continuously at the disposal of those who wished to see him and was thus forced to use the quiet hours of the night for his unending work of popularizing Christian truth amongst the dechristianized masses. These amazing little books, cunningly designed, attractively presented, simple, direct, generous, are a model of what we should have been doing here. Is it not incredible that at this moment we still lack such manuals as Godin's *Soldat du Christ* for the young man 'joining up'; and, most attractive of all, the books designed to show the actual working out in an actual instance of the values of Christian living in the case of a young couple in love, engagement, marriage?[1]

His books show an inside knowledge of working-class psychology. Just as Hugh Lister's trade union friends told him that his early attempts at writing were 'pansy,' so Godin too had to learn to purge himself from that self-intoxicating manner of ordered writing which has been known to work its effects even on those of an alien tongue. Godin too saw that for many modern priests the real renunciation they are called to make now is a cultural renunciation. No man can set his hand to the task of ploughing this stony field and not realize that it involves at least this. "His was a Christianity anti-pharisaic, anti-bourgeois; alive, stamped with the mark of the true Christian spirit." This is the dominant note of the working-class comment on his life.

Is it not a fact that the highest thing one man can still say of another is that 'he is a real Christian'? Do we take enough trouble to analyse just what is meant by this attribution? How far is it in fact 'the real thing'? "Singing and making melody in your hearts . . ." wrote St Paul. Can we say that this is the dominant note of Anglican priestly life? Will future historians speak of 'the joyous swing of our advance'? Will they too 'look on that picture and on this,' as Newman did a hundred years ago?

We have already spoken of that unselfconscious simplicity, that holy madness, that repudiation of bourgeois values which we must increasingly look for in the Christianity of to-day if it is not to become a mere archaism, a fossil culture. What can compare, for instance, with Godin's direct intervention when he was a simple soldier in the French Army on behalf of a refugee family cumbered with children and household goods? They signalled desperately to a large car to stop and help them; but to no purpose. Godin, who saw the incident, ordered the car to stop. It contained a chauffeur and a single large lady with her 'chiens-chiens.' "Impossible to give any assistance." Godin did not hesitate. He shot the animals with his revolver, put the owner in front with the chauffeur and bundled the family into the back.

[1] All of these are obtainable at Pax House, 57 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1.

Similar stories of direct action are to be told of our own country and communion. And there are still alive and with us East End priests who live to remind us of the glories of the apparently unrewarded self-sacrifice which has been poured and still is being poured into that fantastic area of London. Will more 'real Christians' arise, lay and clerical, who will batter their way through the inevitably self-destroying walls of the welfare state? Will the Christians become the 'internal proletariat' of the future? They may yet survive to become again the soul of the world and its salt.

The turning-point in Godin's life was his expression of his fundamental convictions about the truth of the French religious situation as he saw it in *France, pays de mission*, which appeared in September, 1943. This amazing work is too complex to be analysed here. But its utter frankness, its complete freedom from ecclesiastical cant, make it quite unlike anything else that has been written on this Western European problem.[1]

Three months after its publication, a group of priests met at Lisieux and drafted the ground plan of the specialist organization which was to tackle the problem he outlined in his scheme.

But the Mission de Paris was almost immediately to lose its founder and its inspiration. By one of those tricks of divine providence Henri Godin was taken from his colleagues by an accident so simple that it has something almost macabre about it. He was suffocated by the fumes of smouldering bedclothes, set on fire by a short circuit in an electrically heated blanket.

Hugh Lister and Henri Godin. . . . It is good to think that though divided by almost everything else they were not only united in a common conviction of the gravity of this problem of the Church and the working class, but are now united as they never could have been on earth in the mystery of *le Christ Ouvrier* Himself, the common inspiration of their work, its alpha and omega, its first and last, its end and its beginning.

Shall we allow the lives of these two priests to pass unnoticed? Or are they given to us as a warning that not only may our presentation of the Gospel be at fault, but, more than that, that the quality of our Christianity itself is gravely in question?

G. L. Phillips.

The Use of the Psalms To-day—II

The earlier part of this paper outlined the 'spiritual' interpretation of the Psalter and sought to illustrate its legitimacy, its naturalness, its (one might say) inevitability on the lips of the first Christians, who had been Jews, and of all those who realize (as perhaps we do not sufficiently) the continuity of the Church Catholic with the Church of the Jews. Its

[1] See Theology, Jan., 1947, "Towards the Conversion of France," by Montgomery Belgion.

commoner term is the '*mystical*' interpretation; but that word is not only difficult to the layman, too often implying something misty, vague and unreal, but it is also used to cover another kind of interpretation of the Psalms, the '*allegorical*.' Between these two there is a wide difference, but only too often they are lamentably confused. Unhappily the monumental Commentary on the Psalms by Neale and Littledale (great and honoured names) is mainly concerned with the allegorical interpretations and is based almost entirely not on the early Fathers but on the commentators of the later and medieval centuries, when this fashion became common. (Though Neale in his Introduction mentions "the Fathers" (p. 3), yet in his list of "primitive and medieval" authors from whom he has drawn the earliest are St Hilary (*c.* 350) and St Augustine (*c.* 400) and barely half a dozen others before 900. His main sources—and he names nearly 30—are those of the Dark and Middle Ages, when the spiritual interpretation had largely got lost in the wilds of imaginative allegory.) *Allegory* means the taking of words or facts or ideas which have a perfectly natural and right literal meaning and *transferring* them to another quite different sphere of thought—as when Martha and Mary, figures of history, are taken to be pictures, illustrations, 'allegories' of the secular and contemplative life. They might equally well be applied, if desired, to half a dozen other things, or other types might very well be, indeed often are, used to point the contrast. Now the allegorical interpretation of the Psalms begins when devout minds, not content with such legitimate *extended application* (as we may call it) as we have described—"Israel" extended into "the new Israel," the Church; national salvation into spiritual salvation, and so on—have sought to find meaning in, or force meaning upon, every phrase or word. They have used words or phrases simply as starting-points, suggesting pictorially truths (which are—mostly—truths) about prayer, the sacraments, the religious life, the saints, our Lady, as well as about Christ Himself. But these further ideas are *read into*, rather than *out of*, the scriptural words. Let us look at some illustrations.

Psalm lxxii is, as we have noted, a truly Messianic psalm. It is a picture of the ideal king, son of David, and his ideal kingdom of justice and peace, extending "from one sea to the other: and from the flood unto the world's end." "All kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall do him service. . . . prayer shall be made ever unto him, and daily shall he be praised" (vv. 8, 11, 15). Christians use it, with the fullest justification, of the Divine Ascended Lord in whom alone its phrases can find their full meaning. But, says v. 6, "he shall come down like the rain into a fleece of wool"—the reference possibly to Gideon's fleece, and describing (as Carleton says) the "gentle bountifulness" of the monarch, an attribute as true of Christ as of any 'original' earthly king. But that is not enough, say the allegorists. The rain must have some further significance. So it becomes the "silence and secrecy of Christ's coming into the world at His Incarnation," and the fleece is the Blessed Virgin. Is that a *legitimate* extension of interpretation? It is *true* enough; that is not the point. But it cuts across the main drift of the psalm—the ideal monarch and his bounty—to fix on a detail, the method of Christ's Incarnation, which is not here in point. One may

note that this allegorizing method is concerned generally, if not wholly, with such single words or phrases and not with a complete psalm.

Psalm cxlix is a psalm of the triumph of Christ and His saints over His enemies. But the saints wield a "two-edged sword" in their hands. The sword is the weapon of victory. But why "two-edged"? Has the adjective in fact a meaning, any more than the details of a parable, beyond its sharpness and efficacy? But the mention of a sword suggests that the sword is the Word of God (so far so good?), and the two edges become the Old and New Testaments, or the Law and the Gospel. Once again, it is true enough that the Scriptures are in two parts (what of the Apocrypha?) and that they have a mighty power to work for Christ; but is it legitimate to take a single phrase and press it thus? So in the previous verse the saints "rejoice in their beds" (R.V. "sing for joy upon their beds")—*i.e.*, by night as well as day. But the beds: cannot we extract further meaning from them? Neale and Littledale suggest (with ample illustrations) (*a*) "the peaceful secrecy of divine contemplation," (*b*) their quiet consciences, (*c*) the felicity of Paradise, (*d*) the final repose of Heaven. Are *any* of these interpretations relevant *in this passage*? All are perfectly true causes of rejoicing for the saints of God. But they are pressed into the passage here, not drawn from it. (It is indeed true, and to be observed, that Christian theologians like St Thomas Aquinas who approve such interpretations are insistent that they must not be made the foundation of doctrine.)

Or take another instance—showing how far allegory can go—from Psalm civ, the magnificent psalm of creation, which needs indeed little "ful-filling." It remains a glorious act of thanksgiving to God, the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe, 'proper' in Christian use for Whitsunday, as the Feast of the Holy Spirit, the Lifegiver. Verse 15 speaks of the "food brought out of the earth, the wine that maketh glad the heart of man, the oil to make him a cheerful countenance, and bread to strengthen man's heart." It may be fair enough for Christians to see in them a suggestion of the Sacraments of the Church in which those natural elements are used—if we say no more than Carleton that "in their sacramental uses the Creator's purpose attains its highest *fulfilment*." That may not overpass the bounds of '*spiritual*' interpretation—the completion or fulfilment of the natural in the supernatural. But what of the following verses? "The trees of the Lord also are full of sap: even the cedars of Libanus which he hath planted; Wherein the birds make their nests: and the fir-trees are a dwelling for the stork" (vv. 16, 17). Is it not allegory run riot to see here, as Neale and Littledale record, in the (small) birds who make their nests aloft "the members of Religious Orders, supported by the bounty of wealthy and powerful persons, from whose superfluous riches they are fed, in some corner of whose domains they build their convents, aptly called *nests*, because they who erect them are conscious of being mere sojourners, and of having here no continuing city"?—while the stork whose dwelling place in the fir trees "appears" to Neale and Littledale (for the stork does not appear in the Greek or Latin texts used in the Middle Ages) "to signify the saints of secular and domestic life. For the fir tree, from its utility in building and joinery, and from its yielding pitch for binding planks

together so as to exclude wind and damp, serves as a type of settled habitation, a notion brought out by the word *house* (A.V., LXX, Vulgate)." But this does not explain the LXX and Vulgate, which read "*The house of the heron is their leader*" —the *herodius* or heron, believed by the commentators to be a bird of prey of great size and strength, more than a match for the eagle and thus a type of violent and daring sinners. But if these sinners will be converted and take refuge with Christ, then He who is the leader of the birds, of all spiritual and devout souls, becomes the house and shelter of the sinners too and enables them to overcome the evil spirit whom the eagle typifies. Or again, reading the sentence conversely, they tell us that the bold sinner himself, who has once been the house of the *herodius*, on being converted, becomes the leader of spiritual persons, and eminent over them in capacity for good now as for evil previously, as instanced in St Paul and St Augustine" (vol. III, p. 331). Is it surprising that this method is accused of "making anything out of anything"—and the words are Neale's own from his Introduction (vol. I, p. 2)? Is it surprising, further, that those who are suspicious of a method leading to such results should throw aside the whole 'mystical' interpretation of the Psalms as the product of pious imaginings run mad? Is it not therefore very necessary to draw clearly a line of distinction between the spiritual and the allegorical interpretations such as I have tried to indicate? The clear mark of distinction is between genuine fulfilment on the one hand—the Old leading into and finding its full meaning in the New—and incidental likeness, or even imaginary parallels, on the other. And, as we noticed, the former is concerned with the general drift of a psalm, and the latter (the allegorical) with particular words or phrases. Further, I would add again, the allegorist's statements are not necessarily *untrue* to Christian theology because illegitimate or irrevelant in a particular passage.

This is not to say that the allegorical method of interpretation may not yield rich fruits of suggestion and devotion for individual meditation. It is, as Neale admits, perfectly fascinating (vol. I, p. 2) (and therefore, if the true meaning of fascination is taken into account, dangerous), but within its limits, which are perhaps rather personal than corporate, may be valuable, provided always that the distinction between the 'spiritual' and the 'allegorical' interpretation is clearly held.

Before we close, we ought perhaps to note certain instances in which an allegorical interpretation has (we might almost say) been sanctioned or 'canonized' by Christian liturgical use. Two remarkable ones are in the same psalm—xix. The use of that psalm on Christmas Day may be justified as a thanksgiving for God's revelation of Himself—in creation and in the moral law; both of which revelations are consummated and completed by His revelation of Himself in the Incarnation. Thus on Christmas Day Christians can sing the psalm of revelation, knowing the completeness, the *ful*filment of which the original writer or compiler knew only the fragments. But its use on Christmas Day was more probably due to the ancient Christian interpretation of vv. 5, 6, which can only be described as allegorical.

The interpretation is best known from the Office Hymn of Christmas Eve:

> Forth from his chamber goeth he
> That royal home of purity,
> A giant in twofold substance one,
> Rejoicing now his course to run.
>
> From God the Father he proceeds,
> To God the Father back he speeds;
> His course he runs to death and hell,
> Returning on God's throne to dwell.
>
> E.H. 14, vv. 4, 5.

This is a beautiful application of the words, but is *allegory*. "The bridegroom out of his chamber"=Christ (again *allegorically* the bridegroom) coming from His mother's womb, the "giant" recalling His supernatural "twofold Nature" of divinity and humanity; the course He runs "from the uttermost part of the heaven unto the end of it again" becoming the round of His Incarnate Life from His human conception to His ascension and return to glory. Such an interpretation or application has the authority of Christian tradition behind it, but is clearly on the *allegorical* side of our line.

The previous verse (v. 4) gives us another instance. The text "Their sound is gone out into all lands . . ." is itself used by St Paul in Romans x, 18, where it may very well, if not quite certainly, refer to the preaching of the earliest apostles and evangelists. "But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Quite certainly that is the reason why it is commonly used on Feasts of Apostles, and is echoed in some of the Office Hymns for Apostles:

> Let the round world with songs rejoice,
> Let heaven return the joyful voice:
> All mindful of the Apostles' fame,
> Let heaven and earth their praise proclaim.
>
> E.H. 176, v. 1.
>
> Their sound goeth forth: Christ Jesus is Lord.
>
> E.H. 178, v. 4.

But with equal certainty it is an *allegorical* interpretation, not on the direct legitimate line of the proper meaning and drift of the psalm.

Psalm xlv is a borderline case. It is a wedding song—"My heart is inditing . . ."—and was undoubtedly that in origin. Why then does it stand in the Psalter at all? To the Jews it may well have been an instance of the familiar Old Testament thought of God as the bridegroom and Israel His bride (*cf.* Hosea), and to Christians it can be nothing else than the marriage song of Christ the bridegroom and the Church His bride. Is this a legitimate fulfilment—Christ fulfilling the ancient Old Testament picture of the Messianic Bridegroom-King? Or is it allegory?

I will only point further to two famous passages which owe their Christian application and liturgical use to the Latin versions and not to the Hebrew, and so are not represented in our English A.V., R.V., or Prayer-Book version. One is the origin of the lines in the Passiontide Office Hymn:

> Fulfilled is all that David told
> In true prophetic song of old,
> Amidst the nations God, saith he,
> Hath reigned and triumphed from the tree.
>
> E.H. 94, v. 3.

It is the old Latin rendering of Psalm xcvi, 10, "Tell it out among the heathen that the Lord is king"—"*Dominus regnavit a ligno.*"

The other is the origin of the Introit for Feasts of Apostles: "Right dear, O God, are Thy friends unto me, and held in highest honour . . . their rule and governance is exceeding steadfast" (E.H. 717), and is due to the Vulgate translation of Psalm cxxxix, 17, which runs in our version, following the Hebrew, "How dear are *thy counsels* unto me, O Lord: O how great is the sum of them!"

These closing examples are instances of the Christian Church's own use of her book bringing out of her treasury things new and old. I think none the less we must call them undoubtedly allegorical. To know and understand them and their like is a part of that Christian culture which has been largely lost through ignorance of the Bible and of its traditional lines of interpretation. We need not defend allegory. But it is a part of Christian history. Nor do I think we shall commend the continued use of the Psalms to-day to our layfolk—still less, if we need to do so at all, to the outsider and half-instructed—on these grounds. But I do assert that it is of great importance that we should maintain clearly the distinction between the spiritual and the allegorical uses, and that it is in the spiritual interpretation that we shall find the Psalms still, as ever, full of meaning; fuller indeed than their original authors knew, because full of CHRIST.

(*Concluded*)

HENRY DE CANDOLE.

The Shakespearian Pattern

MOST people would agree that Shakespeare's religious metaphysic, supposing him to have had one, is not of academic interest only. In discussing his view of religion, it is necessary to distinguish between what he thought as a private individual—*i.e.*, the views of "Shakespeare the Man"—and what his "book" tells us. There seems no way of knowing, at all surely, what his private views were. He wrote dramatically. All the opinions of the persons in the plays are dramatically appropriate to those persons themselves. We have no real means of

owing whether the author shared them in any particular case or not. ere is, however, something curiously conventional about Shake- are's later life. It is not impossible that all his creative work went o his book and that in a way, exhausted by the effort, apart from his iting, he shared the conventional attitude of Englishmen of his day. : was interested in a shrewd business deal, a coat of arms, and obably, like most of his fellow-countrymen, he was a conventional glican.

When you turn to his works to find their attitude to religion it seems t as impossible. You get the central truths of the Christian religion ntly expressed, as in *King Henry IV*:

> Over whose acres walk'd those blessed feet
> Which fourteen hundred years ago were nail'd
> For our advantage on the bitter cross.
>
> (1 Henry IV, I, i, 25.)

nd you get a passionate scepticism:

> As flies to wanton boys, are we to the gods,
> They kill us for their sport. (Lear, IV, i, 38.)

d because the writing is all dramatic you cannot pile up passages one side or another and say the plays teach this or that metaphysic th such and such qualifications.

But we may note incidentally one or two things that the text of the ays does directly indicate about religion.

1. Religion in Shakespeare is something institutional. It is what ople do, not "with their solitude" but with their togetherness. It is sociated with the state, with coronations, etc., and with social occa- ns, marriages, and burials. Of course people do say their prayers in akespeare, but you get very little of the soul alone with God.

2. There is a strange, almost liturgical use of words like "holy" and lessed":

> When that your flock, assembled by the bell,
> Encircled you to hear with reverence
> Your exposition on the holy text. (2 Henry IV, IV, ii, 5.)
>
> The sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
> Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son. (Richard II, II, i, 5.)

ain the suggestion of institutionalism, of what is done and believed common, and what is taken for granted.

3. There are hints of Catholic things taken so much for granted that y are understated. Consider the phrase "as full of sanctity as the ch of holy bread." One is reminded of a phrase in a poem by Mr S. Eliot, "I have had the bread and wine" (*Collected Poems*, 1909-35, 146), where in both the Catholic mystery is taken so much for granted at there is no need to emphasize it.

The fact that his work is dramatic makes the search for the Shake- carian metaphysic baffling. But there is another thing—viz., that

Shakespeare's world did not give him a coherent intellectual system to work on. Partly following Mr Eliot, we may divide poets into three classes as regards their relation to philosophy.

(i) There are those whose poetry is based on an intellectually coherent and definite system of philosophy, such as Lucretius and Dante, who present us, in Mr Eliot's excellent phrase, with "the emotional equivalent" of the philosophy of Epicureanism and the Schoolmen respectively. They are not philosophers themselves. Their metaphysics are given to them.

(ii) There are those who "philosophize upon their own intuitions"—*i.e.*, poets who regard themselves not only as writers of poetry, but, even more important, as revealers of metaphysical mystery. Such are the Romantics, with whom, says Jaques Rivière, "the literary act came to be conceived as a sort of raid on the absolute and its result as a revelation."

(iii) The third class, to which Shakespeare belonged, like the first, do not regard themselves as metaphysicians. They take what they are given. But their philosophy is not quite certain, not clear-cut.

The background of Shakespeare was the Elizabethan mind. What, then, was the Elizabethan mind? It was in part, but only in part, the Renaissance mind. Now the lineaments of the Renaissance mind are clear enough. They are a boundless sense of human capacity; a conviction of the thorough goodness of human nature; naturalism, individualism, and secular humanism. Some of these features are shared by the Elizabethan mind. There is a belief in human capacity, something of the humanism, a good deal of the naturalism. But the great difference is this, that the Renaissance mind was a radical break with the medieval world outlook, while the Elizabethan mind was a fusion of old and new, the medieval with the modern mind (a fusion no doubt greatly helped by the essential continuity of the post-Reformation Church of England with the English Church of the Middle Ages).

Dr E. W. M. Tillyard, in his book *The Elizabethan World-Picture*, comes to this conclusion of great importance for the background of Shakespeare's work. Selecting six men, in whom the Elizabethan genius was most expressive, Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Hooker, Shakespeare, and Jonson, he says of them: "All these are united in holding with earnestness, passion and assurance to the main outlines of the medieval world-picture as modified by the Tudor régime, although they all know that the coherence of this picture has been threatened."

Thus, although Shakespeare's poetry does not rest on a philosophy so definite as Dante's, yet the Elizabethan mind is some clue to his vision.

It is, however, to the "pattern" and "mystery" of his poetry itself, as elucidated by Prof. Wilson Knight, that I wish to call attention. Mr Knight, in his great trilogy *The Wheel of Fire*, *The Imperial Theme*, and *The Shakespearian Tempest* (Oxford Press), has shown us how to discover the Shakespearian pattern or "meaning" independently of the opinions of the dramatic characters and independently of the philosophy of the time.

Ir Knight turns from the traditional preoccupation with character lysis and plot structure to pay primary attention to the poetic ur of a play. It is the atmosphere, mood, tone, especially the bolism and imagery, which give the "meaning." In his intro- tion to *The Wheel of Fire* (p. xviii) Mr Eliot says: "Our first duty ither critics or 'interpreters' surely must be to grasp the whole gn, and read *character* and *plot* in the understanding of this sub- ene or submarine music."

.ccording to Wilson Knight, the Shakespearian pattern is the pest-music opposition.

Tempests are thus all-important. Taken in opposition with music, form the only principle of unity in Shakespeare 'characterization'; ts, metre, even typical values change; plays are tragical, comical, orical, light as Plautus, or heavy as Seneca; but all may be shown to olve on this one axis" (*Shakespearian Tempest*, p. 16). Plots are built nd tempests, rather than tempests inserted into plots. The plots y but the tempest persists. Knight says that Shakespearian mpest" is "Shakespeare's intuition of tempestuousness at the heart existence" (*ibid.*, p. 16).

he Tempest.—To help us in understanding this mysterious tempest us consider the tempest in the middle scenes of *King Lear*. "Here we st not consider that the physical tempest is merely a poetic device to st our response to the conflict in Lear's mind; if that were the ultimate th, we should be justified in relegating tempest symbolism to second- consideration. The truth is more complex but simpler. The tempest the heath and the tempest in Lear's mind ('the tempest in my mind') one tempest, or rather facets of one tempest. The real tempest is nposed of both and the other elements of conflict too—such as the l's plaintive incompatibilities of humour and Edgar's jarring ord of mock lunacy and, too, the numerous divisions between nce and England, Albany and Cornwall, Goneril and Regan, mund and Edgar, and so on—in fact, the whole play. The play is ision of conflict or tempest" (*ibid.*, p. 16).

Thus the protagonist of Lear is the tempest and not the nominal tagonist. Similarly, the protagonist of Hamlet is the "tempest" of ath; the protagonist of Macbeth, the "tempest" of Evil.

Tempest is a symbol of disorder, conflict, violence, hate, evil, row, etc. It stands for anything opposed to the music of love, peace, l life. Thus the great tragedies are analyses of disorder in all its ms. They are analyses of spiritual and moral tempests.

Allied Symbolism.—With the explicit tempest symbolism go groups of ied symbolism standing for disorder, pain, hate, evil. Briefly:

i) Unnatural phenomena in the heavens—*e.g.*, as a portent of asion:

> *Hubert.* My lord, they say five moons were seen tonight;
> Four fixed, and the fifth did whirl about
> The other four in wondrous motion.
> *King John.* Five moons!
> *Hubert.* Old men and beldams in the streets
> Do prophesy upon it dangerously. (King John, IV, ii, 182.)

(ii) Unnatural phenomena on earth—*e.g.*, ghosts, etc.:

> A little ere the mightiest Julius fell,
> The graves stood tenantless and the sheeted dead
> Did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets. (Hamlet, I, i, 115.)

(iii) Darkness and night; *e.g.*, all the action of *Macbeth* takes place in the night; *cp.* also the darkness and "fog of Acheron" accompanying the conflict in the middle of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

> . . . dark night strangles the travelling lamp. (Macbeth II, iv, 8.)

(iv) Winter imagery (allied to tempest like all foul weather imagery) —*e.g.*, the song "Blow, blow, thou winter wind" in *As You Like It*, II, vi, 174.

(v) Tempest beasts—*e.g.*, "the Hyrcan tiger," wolves, dogs, bears, owls, lions, etc. The raven "breaks" the entrance of Duncan.

(vi) Blood imagery. Many of the tragedies are drenched in blood. In terms of visual imagery, there is a bright redness about *Julius Cæsar*, a dull red glow through the murk of *Macbeth.* Note the combination of tempest, darkness, unnatural events, beast image ("the obscure bird") on the night of Duncan's murder.

> The night has been unruly, where we lay
> Our chimneys were blown down; and, as they say,
> Lamentings heard in the air; strange screams of death,
> . . . the obscure bird
> Clamour'd the livelong night: some say, the earth
> Was feverous and did shake. (Macbeth, II, iii, 59.)

Music.—We pass from the tempest and allied symbolism, the intuition of disorder, conflict, and pain in the state between persons and in the soul, to its opposite, "music." The "music-vision" is the intuition of love, peace, joy, harmony, again in the state between persons and in the soul.

Here is a lovely vision of music as the symbol of love and resurrection. Marina, child of storm, "is found at sea." "The tempests are kind." The peace of tempest conquering love breaks into mysterious music:

> *Pericles.* I embrace you.
> Give me my robes. I am wild in my beholding.
> O heavens bless my girl! But, hark, what music?
> *Helicanus.* My lord, I hear none.
> *Pericles.* None!
> The music of the spheres! List, my Marina.
> *Lysimachus.* It is not good to cross him; give him way.
> *Pericles.* Rarest sounds! Do ye not hear?
> *Lysimachus.* My lord, I hear. (*Music*)
> *Pericles.* Most heavenly music! (Pericles, V, i, 223.)

Allied to "music" are:

(i) Symbols of light—*e.g.*, the moonlight sleeping on the bank in the love scene of Lorenzo and Jessica in *The Merchant of Venice.*

(ii) Feasting—*e.g.*, in the first part of *Timon of Athens.* Timon's vast benevolence expresses itself in tremendous feasts.

ii) Jewels, riches, gold—*e.g.*, Timon shows his love by showering es upon his friends:

> he ne'er drinks,
> But Timon's silver treads upon his lip. (Timon of Athens, III, ii, 77.)

v) Gentle breezes—*e.g.*, associated with the love of Lorenzo and ica:

> The moon shines bright! in such a night as this,
> When the sweet wind did gently kiss the trees
> And they did make no noise. (Merchant of Venice, V, i, 1.)

v) Still waters:

> Tomorrow night, when Phoebe doth behold
> Her silver visage in the watery glass,
> Decking with liquid pearl the bladed grass.
> (Midsummer Night's Dream, I, i, 209.)

ght image linked with still waters and jewels.

i) Flowers—*e.g.*, the pansy, "purple with love's wound," called e-in-idleness" (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, II, i, 166).

ii) Spring—*e.g.*, the love song, "It was a lover and his lass" *You Like It*, V, iii, 17).

s a foil to the combination of tempest-disorder imagery in the sage from *Macbeth* compare this, the description of Cleopatra, en of love:

> The barge she sat in, like a burnish'd throne,
> Burn'd on the water: the poop was beaten gold;
> Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
> The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver,
> Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
> The water which they beat to follow faster,
> As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
> It beggar'd all description: she did lie
> In her pavilion—cloth-of-gold of tissue—
> O'er-picturing that Venus where we see
> The fancy outwork nature. (Antony and Cleopatra, II, ii, 196.)

ombination of images—light "burn'd"; still waters; richness—op of beaten gold"; gentle airs, "perfumed" and "love-sick," h suggestion of flowers, music, "the tune of flutes."

he Supremacy of Music.—This, then, is the Shakespearian pattern, h this, however, to add. There is not an ultimate dualism at the rt of the Shakespearian universe. But as the Shakespearian verse unfolds we see music (*i.e.*, peace, harmony, and above all love) mphant over tempest (*i.e.*, disorder, hate, pain). Rather, love wins ore perfect victory than if there had never been tempest. This is ectly seen in the last play, *The Tempest*, which "distils the very nce of the Shakespearian universe." Here there is a tempest, a ck, loss, separation. This tempest reflects the hate of the "three men sin." But though this tempest wrecks the ship and divides the pany, like all the tempests in the final plays, in the long run it is

harmless. The ship is preserved intact, even their clothes, although drenched, are "new dyed rather than stained," they were divided "only in a dream." And hard on the tempest and the wreck comes the heavenly music of Ariel:

> This music crept by me upon the waters,
> Allaying both their fury and my passion. (Tempest, I, ii, 391.)

The wild waves are "whist" by kisses and the tempest dies away on the island of love and music.

"Shakespeare's poetry," says Wilson Knight, "shows a steady process of simplification. First we have the weltering disorder of the History Plays, plays whose action is continued conflict and tempest, which tempests are nevertheless interthreaded by themes of peace and music. These we find side by side with the early Romances, plays in which tempests are but the condition through which are attained the dreamland melodies of romance. There music conquers tempests. Then we have the great Tragedies wherein tempests are exactly bodied forth in plays whose close texture and metaphysical profundity is addressed to a minute analysis of disorder in all its forms, and in these plays too against tempests sounds still the siren music of peace and love. . . . And thence we pass to the Final Plays. . . . After the conflicting values and jostling problems of the past, now all values are eliminated but love, human or divine, all problems but birth and death. And the mighty symbols of Tempest and Music persist antiphonal charged now with a vaster meaning more mysterious than nature, more ultimate than humanity. At the last vision, we face the systole and diastole of universal things, whereby the tempests of time are dissolved in the orchestration of eternity and the music of the spheres breaks out across the tranquil seas" (*Shakespearian Tempest*, pp. 267-9).

The Religious Pattern.—This great, simple symbolism is natural and universal. Above all, it is the symbolism of religion. It can be closely matched by the symbolism of the Bible and the Prayer Book. It is perhaps interesting to make a point-for-point comparison of the symbolism in the Bible with the tempest-music symbolism of Shakespeare. I take only one example of each (there are hundreds—a concordance will verify this), just as I took only one or two from the hundreds in Shakespeare. Their context shows their appropriateness to disorder and harmony respectively.

A. Tempest Symbolism: "I would make haste to escape: because of the stormy wind and tempest" (Ps. lv, 5).

(i) Unnatural phenomena in the heavens: "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great earthquake: and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind" (Rev. vi, 12-13).

(ii) Unnatural phenomena on earth: "And every mountain and island were moved out of their places" (Rev. vi, 14).

(iii) Darkness and night: "He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night" (John xiii, 30).

v) Winter imagery: "For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over gone" (Song of Solomon ii, 11).
) Tempest beasts: "For he lieth waiting secretly, even as a lion eth he in his den: that he may ravish the poor" (Ps. x, 9).
i) Blood imagery: "For blood it defileth the land: and the land not be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood im that shed it" (Num. xxxv, 33).
. Music Symbolism: "And they sung a new song" (Rev. v, 9).
) Light: "And her light was like unto a stone most precious, even a jasper stone" (Rev. xxi, 11).
i) Feasting: "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage per of the Lamb" (Rev. xix, 9).
ii) Jewels, riches, gold: As (i) above.
v) Gentle breezes: "Awake, O north wind; and come, thou south: w upon my garden" (Song of Solomon iv, 16).
) Still waters: "Lead me forth beside the waters of comfort" xxiii, 2).
i) Flowers: "His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers" ng of Solomon v, 13).
ii) Spring: "The flowers appear on the earth; the time of the ing of birds is come" (Song of Solomon ii, 12).

s not the Shakespearian pattern the same as the pattern of the istian religion? The tempest of a lost world, the music of redemp-, a music even richer for the tempest it has overcome ("O happy ne that brought so great a remedy")? And Shakespeare's vision of blessed island is like another vision: "And I saw a new heaven and w earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away: there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jeru-m, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride ned for her husband. . . . And God shall wipe away all tears from r eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor ng, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are ed away" (Rev. xxi, 1, 2, 4).

S. A. Grave.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

r McDowell is a Lecturer in History at Trinity College, Dublin.
he Rev. G. L. Phillips is Rector of St Mary's Church, Northolt.
ebendary de Candole is Vicar of Henfield, Sussex.
he Rev. S. A. Grave is Vicar of Mosgiel, New Zealand.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE INNER LIFE. By W. F. P. Chadwick.

THE CHURCH OF GOD. By F. J. Taylor.

St Paul's Library. The Canterbury Press. 6s each.

The real interest of these two volumes lies not so much in their own merit as in the auspices under which they appear. In itself, the first is just one more book on the devout life, of a little more than average competence; and the second a (by now) somewhat conventional survey of the material which has become the stock-in-trade of ecumenical discussion about the Church during the past twenty years. Neither would call for more than passing notice were it not that the general introduction to the series and the names of its eminent sponsors make it clear that the books are in the nature of a manifesto. They are written by avowedly Evangelical members of the Church of England who, while welcoming "the recovery of a more definite and authoritarian tone in the presentation of the full Christian faith," are sensitive to "a danger that this recent trend in theology is being exploited, on the one hand by the reactionary forces of Medievalism and Ultramontanism, and on the other by an unreasoning Conservatism which applauds the Barthian mistrust of all human endeavour." In other words, here is an attempt to expound and defend the *via media*—from the quarter one had least expected. The Evangelical tradition has flourished most in recent years outside the Anglican communion, and it has itself sometimes seemed to be one of the extremes between which the middle way was to be trodden. But here is a portent, a renascent Evangelicalism within the Church of England, which promises to take its place in the central tradition of Anglicanism.

One notices, for example, in Mr Chadwick's book, the abandonment, explicit or implicit, of many of the characteristic and formative doctrines of the older Evangelical piety. Here is no belief in total depravity, no insistence on the need for an instantaneous and felt experience of conversion, no under-estimation of the intellectual element in faith, no stress on the assurance of final perseverance. The beginnings of this change of emphasis go back of course well into the last century; but in popular Evangelical piety the old tradition has been very tenacious, and has formed an emotional barrier between Evangelicals and their fellow Anglicans which has prevented the real strength of the tradition from making itself felt in the Church at large.

Mr Taylor's book is perhaps even more significant; for, in spite of what some of the great Evangelicals have taught on the subject, it has been in its conception of the Church that Evangelicalism has been so weak in the past. (It is notable that the index to this book contains the name of no great Evangelical of the 18th and 19th centuries save John Wesley.) Mr Taylor builds his theology of the Church firmly on Scripture, showing in the now familiar manner how the Church is an integral and necessary part of the Gospel; he gives a useful account of the developing doctrine of the Patristic period; deplores the increasing emphasis on the juridical conception of the Church during the Middle Ages; and commends the positive contribution of the Reformers to the

val of the scriptural doctrine of the Body of Christ. He fails, how-
, to consider the disintegrating effects upon the life of the Church of
Protestant insistence upon the doctrine of Justification by Faith. One
he weaknesses of the book is that it makes no attempt to show how
characteristic Reformation belief is to be reconciled with the sound
vigorous doctrine of the Church which it elsewhere describes. If
ngelicalism is to make a serious contribution to our understanding
he complexity of the Anglican tradition here is one place where it
ld be most useful. Another disappointment in Mr Taylor's exposi-
is to be found in his treatment of the ministry. He recognizes that
Christian ministry is no mere human arrangement" and is
imarily of Christ," but refuses to face and discuss the challenge
nted by the traditional form of the belief in apostolic succession,
ing shelter behind P. T. Forsyth's dictum that "the real successor
he apostolate was not the hierarchy, but the canon of Scripture
ten to prolong their voice and compiled to replace the vanished
ess." This is a familiar Protestant position; and it always provokes
same reflection—viz., that the Church which defined the canon was
Church in which the hierarchy took its final shape and made its
ms to apostolic succession. Mr Taylor's purpose is presumably not
nical; but having carried his argument so far he should have faced
e of the more obvious and elementary objections which can be made
. Nevertheless he is speaking in language which admits of theological
ussion; and for this evidence that Evangelicalism within the Church
ngland is unfreezing from its old rigidity without melting into an
eological Liberalism we may be very grateful.

R. Cant.

RHAM.

Rediscovery of the Old Testament. By H. H. Rowley. James Clarke and Co. 10s. 6d.

Quite recently a German Old Testament scholar of repute remarked visiting British theologian that he had been reading an excellent k entitled *The Relevance of the Old Testament*, by Prof. Rowley, and ed: "We want books of that kind in Germany." Discerning readers valued that earlier volume will be eager to read this larger work n Prof. Rowley's prolific pen.

he purpose of the book is to offer a contribution to the religious derstanding of the Old Testament. The results of critical and orical study are presupposed, though in certain cases the author es a digression to present his own views on some important troversial issue—*e.g.*, the date of the Exodus or the problem of flicting religious traditions in Israel.

he opening chapter deals with the reasons why we cannot afford dispense with the Old Testament but must recognize that it stands rganic relation to the New Testament. The historical understanding the Old Testament and its spiritual appreciation must be held ether to the benefit of both activities. Prof. Rowley advocates "a

return to religious values, but without depreciation of all the literary, historical and archæological work of the past century and more."

The next two chapters survey the archæological material and estimate its importance. There is a salutary warning against the tendency to exaggerate the importance of archæology; it cannot prove the spiritual truth of the Bible but it can enable us to appreciate the uniqueness of Old Testament religion as well as the extent of Israel's borrowing from the surrounding nations.

More central to the main purpose of the book are the chapters which follow. Chapters IV and V deal respectively with "The Meaning of History" and "The Growth of Monotheism." Anyone familiar with the works of Old Testament scholars of a generation and more ago will recognize how far the rehabilitation of Moses has gone. Here he is accorded a place of outstanding importance as the virtual founder of Israel's distinctive religion, who gave the impulse to Israel's understanding of the meaning of history, and whose implicit monotheism was the root from which a great development came.

In the chapter on "The Significance of Prophecy" Prof. Rowley gives it as his opinion that the tide has set against an extreme emphasis on the ecstatic elements in prophecy, while on the issue concerning the relation between prophecy and the cult he expresses doubt whether the prophets ever formed part of the regular personnel of the shrines. On the subject of the attitude of the prophets to sacrifice, he maintains that "the great canonical pre-exilic prophets denounced sacrifice that was not the organ of obedience to God," but adds that "we have no means of knowing what they would have said of sacrifice that was the organ of obedience."

Especially valuable in the chapter which deals with the rise of Judaism is the demonstration that it was the men of the post-exilic age who, with all their particularism and legalism, preserved the spiritual riches of the prophetic oracles, used the Psalter in worship and included in their scriptures a challenge to orthodox belief like the Book of Job. They also created the synagogue as the place of spiritual worship.

Concluding chapters develop the Old Testament view of God and man, treat of the contribution of the Old Testament to Christian worship, discuss Israel's eschatological and messianic beliefs and deal suggestively with a subject of growing importance, that of the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. Of particular interest is Dr Rowley's treatment of the problem of the Servant Songs in Second Isaiah.

A book to read and re-read.

N. W. Porteous.

Edinburgh.

Christus und die Zeit. By Oscar Cullmann. Evangelischer Verlag A.G. Zollikon-Zürich. 14.80 Sw. Fr.

Dr Cullmann is Professor of New Testament Studies at Basel. He was stimulated by Bultmann, Barth, and Martin Werner (a disciple of Schweitzer) to produce a straightforward treatment of the conceptio

ime and history which was held by the writers of the New Testa-
it and was current in the primitive Church. He illuminates all
points with which the theological mind is coming to be exercised
egard to the content of the biblical message, and to indicate the
ge of the book is perhaps the most useful way of reviewing it.

is written from the Christocentric, *heilsgeschichtlich*, perspective of
New Testament and of the earliest confessions of faith, a perspective
ificantly different from that of the later ecumenical creeds; different
from that of Bultmann's existentialism or Brunner's 'personalism.'
se are shown, by contrast, to have evaded the ultimacy which
biblical writings ascribe to temporally ordered events. Any appeal
hat is 'beyond time' is foreign to the Bible and a distortion of the
pel.

Cullmann divides his book into four sections: an exposition of the
al character of *Heilsgeschichte*, under the heading οἰκονομία;
uniqueness of the dispensations, ἐφάπαξ; *Heilsgeschichte* and
ersal history, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα; *Heilsgeschichte* and the individual
son—"your life is hid with Christ in God."

The Bible witnesses to a temporal line of events, whose points (καιροί)
e central significance for faith and salvation; and also to a grouping
events into durations (αἰῶνες), which may be bounded on one side
he other or on both. The fundamental division of the time-series,
mon to Christianity and Judaism, is into three ages: before creation,
ween creation and parousia, and after parousia. But a twofold
sion has been superimposed on the series, without destroying the
ificance of the threefold one. History has a mid-point, which for
Jews is between this second age and the age to come, but for
istians is at the mid-point of this age—the coming and the work of
ist. The time-series, hitherto obscure, is illuminated in both direc-
s from this mid-point; and the illumination extends to the (tempor-
ordered) ages before creation and after the parousia. This 'before'
'after' must be taken seriously, as must the historical form of
esis and Revelation. The N.T. mind never strays beyond the
cept of temporal development, and rightly not. The revelation is
ressed in the form of prophecy, which is the factor uniting myth and
ory into a consistent whole. God is 'above the ages' in the sense that
is Lord over times and ages, presiding over the temporal develop-
t in freedom, wisdom and love. The principle of operation
ernible throughout is that of election and representation, the
cess being one of narrowing to a point in the time before Christ
widening from a point in the time up to the parousia.

pace prohibits any mention of the positions established in the
ting second half of the book, which in any case would need fairly
treatment. It is perhaps a pity that the author was evidently un-
liar with British N.T. scholarship, but it must be said that there
o book in English which gives such a straightforward and com-
hensive treatment of these Biblical insights of which we have all
n made vaguely aware.

W. A. Whitehouse.
Mansfield College,
Oxford.

THEOLOGY AND SANITY. By F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

Mr Sheed designs to show us that only theology can preserve man's integrity of mind. He is well aware that the intellect is not more important in religion than the will; but he concerns himself largely with the former because he believes that that is the most neglected. He writes with his customary lucidity, vigour and wit. (He is, in fact, a much more effective, trenchant apologist than many others who are better known.) Nor is the book all on a defensive level. The sections, for instance, upon the sacrifice of the Mass, the Mystical Body of Christ, and the Kingdom of Heaven are finely *biblical* and positive. There is, perhaps, an air of rather too self-conscious labour about the book: "follow me very closely now, this is hard to grasp," or similar warnings, occurs about seven times in seventy pages. No doubt he is right to avoid citing authorities as a rule; but he might have told his readers that among the "minority of Catholic philosophers" who deny that reason can show the universe to have had a beginning in time was St Thomas, who might be thought single-handed to turn a minority into a majority. It is good to find little overt semi-Pelagianism in the book (except, perhaps, this sentence on the people of the O.T.: "only a human intellect at full strength would by its own unsupported power hold on to one God . . ." (p. 149)). Personally I am grateful for an excellent citation from Odo of Cambrai on original sin (p. 140).

Two criticisms must be made. *Tactical:* Would it not have been better to publish the book in three volumes at 4s. 6d. each? Those whom it could most help will not spend 12s. 6d. in one go on any book not containing illustrations. Alternatively the book might well have been condensed (for it contains some repetition and some over-development of the obvious). *Strategic* (and more serious): Is this really the book for the times? Here and there there are phrases, and throughout there is the feeling, that Mr Sheed has at the back of his mind the sort of questions thrown at his Catholic Evidence lectures in public. But to be too conscious of the dated kind of atheist is to run the danger of being dated oneself. ("If the tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil literally means a tree, at least it is a tree unknown to our botanists: the tree we know do not bear fruit of such profound intellectual and spiritual consequences" (p. 131) suggests that rather cheap level of controversy.) The author does not show himself aware—or does not make his readers aware—of the sort of objection to his argument which would base itself on the belief that the words, such as "contingency," "nothing," "being," etc., which he uses so effectively as skeleton keys to open all problems, are unfortunately made, not of metal, but of india-rubber: the right shape, but unable to unlock anything. And this objection is symptom of a deeper ailment which his treatment will not lead back to sanity. Twice he shows an inkling of a more "existential" approach (p. 57: "We could not properly ask of a stone or a potato or an oyster Who is it?"; and pp. 274-85, when he tries to stretch the inelastic limits of the definition, "man is a rational animal"): if he could make proper use of these glimpses he might help us more; he might even realize that perhaps "to be restored, our sickness must grow worse." Meanwhile I fear his book will largely be read by those who ought to

reading bigger and more authoritative works. If so, no one will et it more than Mr Sheed.

MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, C.R.

RDIFF.

LIAM OF GLASSHAMPTON. Friar; Monk; Solitary. By Geoffrey Curtis, C.R. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

is difficult to imagine a clearer commentary upon the words of Lord, "My kingdom is not of this world," than this story of the of a single-minded servant of God. It is an attractive book, full terest, and delightfully written. The few charming snapshots it ains, which have evidently been chosen with great care, provide the illustration which is effective. We owe a debt to the author book which certainly may be classed as "out of the ordinary." Father Curtis has had a difficult task. The real theme of the book o difficult for it ever to have a popular appeal, and in a sense is really not enough material available to make it anything but t. It is emphatically a book with one idea running all through it. . therefore, a book for a small public. And even so, perhaps the one cism which may be offered is that the author has quoted somewhat freely from Father William's letters.

he theme of the book is that of the need of the founding in the rch of England of a Contemplative Order for men if the Church is land is ever to take a real step forward. It is all expressed in one ather William's letters—"The Church of England has miserably d God. She for centuries had the immense advantages of wealth, llings and State support, and look at the teeming masses she never hes. I would not knock it down, but I would bring up a new way, what is there but the apostolic way of deep consecration? This cannot be sustained, so the ages of the Church show, without some of Religious Life. . . . And such a life needs a garden set apart by Lord for the cultivation of His choicest flowers."

this end William Sirr devoted his life, and in due course became mber of the Society of Divine Compassion, of which for some years as Superior. But his soul sought the contemplative rather than active life of religion, and step by step the way opened which ed to point to the founding of a Contemplative Order. It is a e story, full of beauty, and there is deep pathos in his constant pointment at his failure to do so. Yet no word of complaint from him. Again and again he writes such words as these—"I how good it is if God breaks up all one's plans. One can so easily e best things and yet not be in the way of His Will."

those with whom he came in contact recognized him as indeed a of God. He was utterly devoted to God's service, and lived a life most unbelievable austerity. He was full of delightful humour, and act that there was deeply ingrained within him the sense of the in the social application of the Catholic Faith to the needs of the

poor" made him all his life the friend of publicans and sinners. He was an accomplished man of business, and his early training in architecture stood him in good stead when, out of a remote and derelict stable, he created a building of pure beauty, which, in solitude and often in disappointment, he filled to overflowing with his prayers and selflessness. The book is the story of an outward failure. This may have been partly due, as his biographer hints, to the fact that at times, saint though he was, he was not the most easy of men with whom to live. But it was a failure which has become, and surely will increasingly become, in the words of the title of a small book he wrote concerning the religious life, a "Blossoming of the Desert."

DENIS TYNDALL.

PERTH.

LÉON BLOY : A STUDY IN IMPATIENCE. By Albert Béguin. Translated by Edith M. Riley. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

Bloy (1846-1917) was an astounding man, and it is not surprising that books go on being written about him. All the books, however, are not of the same quality. In translation at any rate M. Béguin's volume of four essays (1943), prefaced here by a specially written "sketch" of Bloy's "life and work," is not to be compared with *Introduction à Léon Bloy* by Pierre Termier (1930) or *Mission de Léon Bloy* by Stanislas Fumet (1935). Those two would seem to be the best. Nevertheless M. Béguin may help us to determine what is dross and what pure metal.

He transcribes numerous fragmentary extracts from his subject's own writings, and these are likely to cool rather than to foment a desire to become acquainted at first-hand with productions of an unruly and flamboyant pen. In the welter of Bloy's authorship the novel *La Femme pauvre* and also the *Journal* glow now and then with a tempestuous agony, and from their pages goes up a prayer without device and truly moving. But greatness in literature Bloy did not attain, and at the end of his life he knew he had missed it. Writing to a friend he then made the admission: "Je n'ai pas fait ce que Dieu voulait de moi, c'est très certain. J'ai rêvé, au contraire, ce que je voulais de Dieu, et me voici à soixante-huit ans n'ayant dans les mains que du papier." The extent of his literary achievement is lessened by an inability to avoid relating all things to himself and making him disgusts and upsets the centre of the universe. As he says naïvely enough in the dedication of his book *L'Ame de Napoléon*: "I saw no other way of considering this extraordinary man than by imputing my own soul to him." From the moment of his conversion as a young bookkeeper his life was one long struggle with beggary, and no doubt he suffered neglect and rebuff. He had to wait till he was thirty-eight to get a book published, and even then it brought him next to nothing. Another remained in MS for fourteen years, and one only saw the light posthumously. However, on the destitution and misfortune for ever dogging him he traded. He once nicknamed himself "the ungrateful

gar"; he was always an angry one. He imagined that because he was niless he must be the Lord's elect, and that sanctity followed on an pty pocket. He behaved as if he could owe his fellow-men nothing kindness and help were simply his due. To social obligation he ained oblivious, and the sole ground of his condemnation of the nan society was that it roused his aversion. Page after page of his ks are filled with excruciation, execration, and curses. Never by any nce does the gleam of a smile break through the frowns of his onic ill-temper. This protracted anger, ever being warmed up with istrous invective, comes in the end to seem funny, and he stands redited. His controversial boldness and vigour fall impotent. In king he disposes of Schopenhauer by calling him a *cuistre* he rs the warning *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*; in ridiculing Zola for having the courage to stand up for Alfred Dreyfus he but betrays his own llness.

hus it is largely dross that he has left in his writings. Yet paradically there is pure metal too. As a pilgrim on his way to the olute and gifted with apocalyptic vision, his sincerity is not open uestion. Above all, cantankerous cadger though he may have been, did inspire irrepressible devotions. Masses of his letters were sured. Jacques Maritain and his wife are but two members of a of seraphic host that, after giving him tender admiration while was alive, now since his death their loud uplifted angel trumpets w in memory of his lasting impress on souls. He *was* an astounding n.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

TERBOROUGH.

NTRASTS: THE ARTS AND RELIGION. By Alec Robertson. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Unquestionably many people have been attracted to the Catholic ement in the English Church less because they were interested in doctrinal questions it raised than because they readily responded ne æsthetic accompaniments it introduced into religious practice. recalls at least one London church in which it was not uncommon discover members of the congregation following the mellifluous ng of the Mass with the musical score while the elaborate ritual ements of the several ministers in their handsome vestments eeded with punctilious precision. That the arts have in such a case iritual and religious value for the appropriately cultivated can cely, in charity, be denied even by those who for various reasons themselves repelled by these embellishments. But, as the book under w observes, men cannot live on æstheticism—or asceticism—as s in themselves; and the apparent decline of the Anglo-Catholic ement may well have been assisted both by sensuous excesses and he shabby inferiority of forms of worship, felicitous in themselves, any places where high standards of liturgical culture have proved ossible to maintain. Yet at the time when a general decline in

religious observance is widely lamented, vastly more people than ever before have become interested in music and the arts; examples of this, among many, are the extraordinary success of the deliberately cultural Third Programme of the B.B.C. and the notable popularity of the exhibition of the King's pictures. This Roman Catholic writer goes so far as to make the surprising statement that for "many of the younger generation art has taken the place of religion, and perhaps it will be art's revenge at the indifference which religion has displayed to it since the Renaissance that through the work of the artist, rather than the labours of the priest, men will return to religion. . . . Cardinal Newman said that poetry was 'the refuge of those who have not the Catholic Church to flee to and repose upon,' but it would be far more true to say that poetry is the refuge of those who find it impossible to rest quietly on that rocky bed! Yet truth lies there, as (*sic*) the bottom of a muddy well, and sooner or later the well must once more be cleaned out."

In order to establish the religious quality of artistic achievement this book considers the work of several contrasting figures in music, poetry and painting; with a preliminary discursus on the implications of some writings of Keats and Maritain in this connexion, and a final appraisement of the whole thesis, taken imaginatively from the crypt of Notre-Dame-de-Sous-Terre in Chartres Cathedral. Criticism is somewhat disarmed by the assertion in the foreword that the author writes for the simple, not the knowledgeable in art, and proposes in his treatment to leave the artists he considers to speak for themselves with as little interruption from him as possible. Certainly the matter he assembles concerning Bach and Handel, Milton and Shakespeare, Housman and Hopkins, and finally El Greco, Blake and Van Gogh, is familiar enough, and the book is very heavily charged with quotation (the sources of which are not always indicated). It tends to give the impression of a commonplace book with connecting links of slight commentary. That the divine wind of inspiration bloweth where it listeth is agreeably apparent—this company includes but two members of the Roman Church; one a convert—and indeed the author hopes he may be suggesting some positive contribution towards the healing of the wounds of Christendom. For those of similar temperament perhaps he is.

J. H. L. Waterson.

Ripon.

SHORTER NOTICES

Flecker of Dean Close. By Charles Williams. The Canterbury Press. 6s

The Man who made a School. By Geoffrey Hoyland. S.C.M. Press 4s. 6d.

Both books are about Church of England clergymen who devoted the major portion of their working years to the building up of great schools. Both men were eminently successful—Flecker in being the first headmaster and founder of Dean Close; Thring in virtually

founding Uppingham. Flecker began at Dean Close in 1886 with boys; in 1924 he retired, leaving a school of 250. Thring in 1853 came headmaster of Archdeacon Johnson's Elizabethan foundation Uppingham, inheriting about 40 pupils and quite inadequate premises; in 1887 he died in harness, leaving a flourishing school of 300. Both headmasters could have added to their numbers, but refrained from doing so because they were convinced that no school should become so large that the headmaster would be unable to know all his pupils. Both men came to their major life's work having received training in a varied experience. They had both been curates for some years.

Nevertheless the two men were very different and had very different tasks to face. We take Thring first, as being the elder. From the start he was faced with an apathetic and hostile body of school governors, quite out of sympathy with a man of Thring's vision and drive. He went to Uppingham, having evolved after deep ponderings during a long illness a "blue print" for education, and determined to carry it into effect in this small grammar school of this small midland town. The success of this experiment he dreamed would revolutionize the education of the whole country. In his first aim he was successful, in his wider dreams he was not. He was a humanist, albeit rather a grim one, who aimed at educating for life, and a useful, full and rich life. He has been called also the greatest Christian of his age. He tried to use the varied experiences of the *whole* life into the narrowed compass of the school life. He understood boys and tried to make these experiences lead to unity of life. The school was to be primarily a large family. There is that rare element of greatness in Thring, combined as it so often is with a touch of mysticism.

Flecker came to Dean Close after many reforms unknown in Thring's earlier years had taken place in the schools of the country. Probably Flecker profited indirectly from Thring's pioneering. Flecker had not to fight his school governors nor pecuniary embarrassment once he reached Dean Close. He was less of a dreamer than Thring and perhaps more lovable. Ecclesiastical party politics entered more into his world than Thring's, as Dean Close was founded as an evangelical trust, a memorial to one of the party. He was not narrowed by this and at the same time gave every satisfaction to his governing body, for he too was alive to the full life, though in a more unconscious way. He enjoyed a happy married life, had very varied interests and delighted in the use of the intellect. Thus he avoided making life too pious at Dean Close, allowing religion to "infiltrate through laughter" and quite natural dealings with his pupils. Unlike Thring, he retired from the headmastership and was for the last fourteen years of his life the much loved and respected Vicar of Staines.

Mr Williams gives us a picture of Flecker, the man, his home life, his family and his work; Mr Hoyland is more concerned to give us a study of the aims of a great man, in the hope of contributing towards the solution of some of our educational problems. Mr Williams' is the first biography of Flecker; Mr Hoyland makes no pretence at being original and acknowledges his debt to the earlier biographers of "our

greatest Victorian schoolmaster." Probably Mr Williams does enter the realm of contemporary issues in using this study to interpret the genuine evangelical outlook and to show its attractiveness.

Both books can be recommended.

IAN R. CARRICK, O.G.S.

NORTHOLT PARK.

The Teaching Parson and his People. By J. R. Lumb. National Society and S.P.C.K. 6s.

"My people are gone into captivity for lack of knowledge." So wrote the Old Testament prophet and perhaps of no other period in the history of our Church has this been more true than the present one. Mr Lumb attributes this failure of the Church to recognize her teaching ministry to three factors: first, that there really is no agreed *corpus* of Anglican theology; secondly, in comparison with the pre-Reformation Church there has been a decline of missionary impulse; and thirdly, there is the ever-present tendency to neglect the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We have tended to think too much of religious education in terms of religious instruction only, and that mainly in terms of giving instruction to children and adolescents. Important as this is, the parish priest at the same time has to educate his adult congregation. If a layman may venture to pass judgment, the outline and plans suggested by Mr Lumb in his book seem thoroughly practicable and not beyond possibility in any parish, rural or urban, provided that the incumbent is prepared to take a long-term view and not judge by immediate results or be led astray by the fallacy that quantity takes precedence over quality.

M. S. DAWSON.

WREXHAM.

Whatsoever He Shall Say. The First Theophila Correspondence. By Ferdinand Valentine, O.P. Blackfriars. 5s.

This small book is presented in the popular form of a series of letters between one of the Dominican Fathers and "Theophila," who may be taken to represent any young man or woman who, having passed out of the stage of adolescence, is anxious to learn how to progress in the spiritual life. The letters presuppose that the person concerned is a practising Catholic with a background of the Church and Sacraments. Each chapter or letter builds on the previous one—beginning with the fact of creation, the distinction between the natural and supernatural, and the possession of free-will. The next two sections deal with the gift of Grace, through which God calls us to participate in His creative activity. The letters connected directly with prayer stress the activity of the mind in meditation and spiritual reading and the necessity of a rule of life; finally all is summed up in the offering of the Eucharist. "Theophila" raises a few points in her letters which may seem to

ny readers trivial, and there is a debatable remark about provi-ace on p. 30 (Does God so control the transit of the influenza us that its periodic frustration of our plans may be said to be His l?); nevertheless the book contains sound and wise direction.

M. S. DAWSON.

REXHAM.

Hundred Years of Blessing. The Community of St Mary the Virgin, Wantage. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

urch Dedications of the Oxford Diocese. By K. E. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford. O.U.P. 5s.

t is not very often that we are given an "inside and inner" picture the life of a religious community of women. In fact, most com-nities make it a point of their rule that members keep careful ard over the sanctity of their enclosure. It is possible for an outsider be in close touch with such a community and yet to be ignorant of inner workings, plans and achievements. There is normally an tire absence of boasting and glorying, of advertisement and publicity. e hidden life of Nazareth is the natural gospel background of the igious life. The wisdom of the Bishop of Oxford, the Visitor of S.M.V., has directed that this anonymous account of the inner rit and outward activities of this community should be made available the public at large. Here is revealed to us a hundred years of history a small portion of the Church's life. Yet what wonderful revelation!—rely a reference to the movements, controversies, statistics, ecclesi-ical politics, the stock-in-trade of the Church historian. Rather are given a picture of the Divine action, the planting of the seed, shooting, growth, spread, fruit. Under God, there stands William n Butler, vicar of the small downland Berkshire town of Wantage, pired with burning zeal, rock-like faith, austere to man, inwardly rt to the call of the Holy Spirit. Butler, a son of the Church of England, Prayer Book man (yet not insular: he visited the French religious mmunities to obtain practical experience of women's orders), Francis de Sales, St Augustine of Hippo, such are the agencies which orm the rule and temper of C.S.M.V. And what a result, from its artbreaking beginnings to its wonderful and deep influence over h and poor, cleric and layman, old and young: its great schools, penitentiaries, its mission centres in town, in countryside, repeating whole pattern in India, in Africa. The amazing fruitfulness of its rders," so notably described in the chapter "Kith, Kin and Friends." is book reveals a unity amidst the necessary multiplicities of the owth of C.S.M.V. It is not just a chronicle, a pleasant home-made apbook. The particular "spirit," undoubtedly springing from its nder, permeates the whole book. Whether it is a description of the broidery room, a school, some pioneer work in Africa and most pressively the blitzed Houses, the temper and behaviour of the sters reflect the rule and spirit of C.S.M.V. The variety of its

works, the ease of its adaptations to differing circumstances, these things come from the "unity" of its outlook, fashioned by the tradition of its own particular spirituality. After reading certain recent works which extol the parish clergy this book tempts one to say "the real heroes are the heroines," and there is much to be said for this. Nevertheless, once more under God, the vicar of Wantage, the parish priest, the founder, is the heroic figure. This growth of disciplined, sacrificial souls within the religious life rises within the life of the Church and in particular the Church of England. Here is a "glorying" in which all may share, an evident token of the Divine activity in our midst. This book will surely become a "classic" of Anglican spirituality. It will undoubtedly be an instrument of furthering new vocations and will enable Churchpeople to join with the Sisters in their coming centenary in a fervent *Laus Deo*.

The Bishop of Oxford in *Church Dedications* has shown us how a bishop's spare time may be well used. We hasten to add that the spare time is mostly the forced leisure of illness. The book breathes all the painstaking carefulness, thoroughness and scholarship for which the author of *The Vision of God* is rightly famed. There is, however, a certain whimsical atmosphere in this study, a kind of first-class sublimation of those mental elements which are expended in good crossword puzzles and detective stories. The Bishop generously supplies you both with the material and the method; the book takes you along to share with the author the joy of the satisfying clue and the way to its achievement. There are two main questions and possibly a third. Do the Church dedications of the diocese of Oxford reveal in their choice anything of the spirit of the diocese and people? What is the meaning of the dedication of a cluster of churches to the Assumption of our Lady? What do we learn from "odd" dedications? It seems unfair to give the answers in a review. The book is to be read, it cannot be enjoyed through a notice. The Bishop writes very humbly in his preface of this child of his leisure; to others it stands revealed as a work of his love for the diocese and its churches, and one which gives to its readers both erudition and enjoyment.

WANTAGE. CYRIL GARDNER.

It is a welcome sign of the return towards a state of peace that the first number of *Vigilæ Christianæ; a review of early Christian life and language* has been produced by the North Holland Publishing Co. of Amsterdam. Among the associate editors the name best known to readers of THEOLOGY will probably be that of Prof. A. D. Nock of Harvard. The first number contains articles on "le Latin Commun et le Latin des Chrétiens," by Christine Mohrmann, "Pompa Diaboli," by J. H. Waszink (in French), and "The Original Doctrine of Valentine" (*i.e.*, Valentinus the Gnostic), by G. Quispel. All of these show a very high standard of scholarship, and it is to be hoped that *Vigiliæ Christianæ* will attract the interest and support it deserves from readers of THEOLOGY.

W. L. K.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher